

REMARKS

1 The Examiner has initially rejected claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,419,223 to Morin. The Examiner has also
initially rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Morin
patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,082,555 to Read. Applicants respectfully disagree
5 with each of these rejections. However, in an effort to expedite the prosecution of the
present application, applicants have amended claim 1, from which claims 2-6 each
ultimately depend. The Examiner found that claim 3 would be allowable if rewritten to
include the limitations of claims 1 and 3. Applicants have amended claim 1 to include
10 the limitation that the system is further comprised of "at least one solids screen retaining
pin positioned to selectively secure said solids screen in a position closely adjacent the
second opening of said hopper." Applicants assert that amended claim 1 is in condition
for allowance. Claim 3 has been cancelled. Claims 2, 4, 5 and 6 each depend from
15 claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons set forth hereinabove
with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to
reconsider and allow claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6.

 Claims 7, 13 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being
unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,258,011 to Prazmowski. The Examiner argues
20 that each of the structural limitations found within claim 7 can be found within the
Prazmowski device, except for a rotatably mounted spray bar, as disclosed by U.S.
Patent No. 4,807,854 to Mitchell. The Examiner argues that the addition of the rotating
spray assembly from Mitchell to the Prazmowski device would have been an obvious

1 combination to a person of skill in the art. Applicants respectfully disagree with the
aforementioned rejections. However, in an effort to expedite the prosecution of the
present application, applicants have amended claim 7. The Examiner found that claim
8 would be allowable if rewritten to include the limitations of claims 7 and 8. Applicants
5 have amended claim 7 to include the limitation that the spray bar is adapted to be
selectively rotated about its longitudinal axis to selectively control the aim of the plurality
of holes formed therein. Accordingly, Claim 7 is believed to be in condition for
allowance. Claims 9, 13 and 20 now depend from amended claim 7 and are also
believed to be allowable. Claim 8 has been cancelled. The Examiner is respectfully
10 requested to reconsider claims 7, 9, 13 and 20 and allow the same.

The Examiner rejected claim 21 as being unpatentable over Prazmowski and
Mitchell and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,775,237 to Reilly, et al. The Examiner
also rejected claim 22 as being unpatentable over Prazmowski and Mitchell and further
15 in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,863,277 to Neal, et al. Applicants respectfully disagree with
each of the aforementioned rejections. However, claims 21 and 22 depend from
amended claim 7, which is believed to be allowable as set forth hereinabove.
Accordingly, claims 21 and 22 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons set
forth hereinabove with respect to amended claim 7.

20 The Examiner found that claim 10 would be allowable if rewritten in independent
form to include each of its limitations and the limitations of claim 7. Applicants have
cancelled claim 10 and rewritten the same as new claim 23, which includes the

1 limitations of original claims 7 and 10. Accordingly, new claim 23 is believed to be in
condition for allowance.

5 The Examiner found that claim 11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent
form to include each of its limitations and the limitations of claim 7. Applicants have
cancelled claim 11 and rewritten the same as new claim 24, which includes the
limitations of original claims 7 and 11. New claim 23 is, therefore, believed to be in
condition for allowance.

10 The Examiner found that claim 14 would be allowable if rewritten in independent
form to include each of its limitations and the limitations of claim 7. Applicants have
cancelled claim 14 and rewritten the same as new claim 25, which includes the
limitations of original claims 7 and 14. New claim 25 is, therefore, believed to be in
condition for allowance. Claims 15-19 each ultimately depend from new claim 25 and
are believed to be allowable, according to the Examiner's comments regarding the
same.

15 In light of the above amendments and remarks, applicant asserts that each of the
pending claims is believed to be patentable over the cited prior art. Accordingly,
applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the same.

20 No fees or extensions of time are believed to be due in connection with this
amendment; however, please consider this a request for any extension inadvertently
omitted, and charge any additional fees to Deposit Account No. 502093.

Respectfully submitted,



SHANE M. NIEBERGALL
Registration No. 44,974
THOMTE, MAZOUR & NIEBERGALL
Attorneys of Record

2120 S. 72nd Street, Suite 1111
Omaha, NE 68124
(402) 392-2280

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that the original of this AMENDMENT for JAMES A. HELLBUSH, ET AL., Serial No. 09/970,594, was mailed by first class mail, postage prepaid, to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 20th day of July, 2005.


SHANE M. NIEBERGALL